



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,595	08/01/2006	Raymond Wilhelmus Louis Lafarre	NL040116	3647
24737	7590	01/09/2009	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			HARVEY, JAMES R	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2833	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
01/09/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/597,595	LAFARRE, RAYMOND WILHELMUS LOUIS
	Examiner James Harvey	Art Unit 2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) requires a legible copy of: (1) each foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited pending U.S. application, the application specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion, unless the cited pending U.S. application is stored in the Image File Wrapper (IFW) system; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)), and MPEP § 609.04(a), subsection I. states, "the list ... must be submitted on a separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all "statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without

underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase “Not Applicable” should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A “Sequence Listing” is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required “Sequence Listing” is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

- The interlineations made in the specification or amendments to the claims could lead to confusion and mistake during the issue and printing processes. Accordingly, the specification and claims are required to be rewritten before passing the case to issue. See 37 CFR 1.125 and MPEP § 608.01(q).

Claim Objections

- Claims 3-14 submitted 3-9-08 are seen to supersede claims submitted 8-1-06 and are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim can not depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). However, applicant's remarks dated 8-1-06 state that it was applicant's intention to file a preliminary

amendment to eliminate multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, the claims 3-14 are being examined based upon the claims dated 8-1-06.

- The dating of the amendments made in the claims could lead to confusion and mistake during the issue and printing processes. Accordingly, the claims are required to be rewritten before passing the case to issue.

Drawings

- The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.
- In reference to Claim(s) 3, 200 areas are not shown. An examination on the merits (as best understood) is addressed herein.

In reference to Claim(s) 4, the numerical value of 16 is not shown. An examination on the merits (as best understood) is addressed herein.

In reference to Claim(s) 8 and 9, the neighboring structure is not shown. An examination on the merits (as best understood) is addressed herein.

- No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- The following claims is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In reference to Claim(s) 8 and 9, the structure is not shown and it is not clear how the spring influences the neighboring lines or neighboring conductive areas. An examination on the merits (as best understood) is addressed herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- * The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

** The following claim(s) is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Brunt, Jr. et al. (5181853; herein referred to as d1).

In reference to Claim(s) 1, document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a system for detachably connecting a first electronic component (15) with a second electronic component (17),
whereby a large number of signal lines of the first component are connected with corresponding signal lines of the second component (17),
whereby a sheet-like part of the first component is provided with a number of

conducting areas (19) arranged in an array at the surface of the sheet-like part near an edge of said sheet-like part,

whereby each of said conducting areas (19) is connected with a signal line of the first component,

and whereby a part of the second component (17) is provided with a number of contact elements (19) arranged in an array at the surface of said part,

whereby each of said contact elements (19) is connected with a signal line of the second component (17), whereby each contact element (19) has a contact surface for contacting one of said conducting areas (19) of the first component,

and whereby means (23) are present to push each of said conducting areas (19) of the first component against a corresponding contact element (19) of the second component (17).

In reference to Claim(s) 2, d1 shows applicant's claimed structure.

In reference to Claim(s) 16, document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a method for detachably connecting a first electronic component (15) with a second electronic component (17), whereby a large number of signal lines of the first component are connected with corresponding signal lines of the second component (19), whereby a sheet-like part of the first component is provided with a number of conducting areas (19) arranged in one or more arrays at the surface of the sheet-like part near an edge of said sheet-like part (2), whereby each of said conducting areas (19) is connected with a signal line of the first component, and whereby a part of the second component (17) is provided

with a number of contact elements (19) arranged in one or more arrays at the surface of said part, whereby each of said contact elements (19) is connected with a signal line of the second component (6), whereby each contact element (19) has a contact surface for contacting one of said conducting areas (19) of the first component, and whereby each of said conducting areas (19) of the first component is pushed against a corresponding contact element (19) of the second component (17).

4.2 Similarly, D2 and D3 disclose all features of claim 16.

** The following claim(s) is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ii (4824391; herein referred to as d2).

In reference to Claim(s) 1, 15 and 16, document D2 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a clamping member (14) for a for detachably connecting a first electronic component (140) with a second electronic component (142), whereby a large number of signal lines of the first component are connected with corresponding signal lines of the second component, whereby a sheet-like part of the first component is provided with a number of conducting areas (146) arranged in one or more arrays at the surface of the sheet-like part near an edge of said sheet-like part, whereby each of said conducting areas (146) is connected with a signal line of the first component, and whereby a part of the second component (142) is provided with a number of contact elements arranged in one or more arrays at the surface of said part, whereby each of said contact elements is connected with a signal line of the second component, whereby each contact element has a contact surface for contacting one of said conducting areas

(146) of the first component, which clamping member (14) comprises a row of leaf springs (98), whereby each leaf spring (98) can push more than one conducting area (146) of the first component (140) against corresponding contact elements (146) of the second component (142).

In reference to Claim(s) 2, d2 shows applicant's claimed structure.

In reference to Claim(s) 5, d2 shows applicant's claimed structure.

I

** The following claim(s) is/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d2 in view of Kato (6062873; herein referred to as kk).

In reference to Claim(s) 3, d2 shows substantially the invention as claimed.

However d2 is not explicit as to the details of 500 conducting areas.

It is known that a component can have numerous conducting areas. Kk is an example within the art that shows 203 (figure 3) numerous conducting areas. To increase conducting areas to 500 is seen to be within the level of one skilled in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and having access to the references to be able to reach the numerical value of 500.

The rationale for such a rejection is that one skilled in the art could have combined the known elements and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

In reference to Claim(s) 4, d2 shows substantially the invention as claimed.

However, d2 is not explicit as to the details of sixteen times smaller.

It is known in the art to make areas smaller. Kk is an example within the art that shows a smaller area.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and having access to the references to be able to make the area smaller.

The rationale for such a rejection is that one skilled in the art could have combined the known elements and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

In reference to Claim(s) 6 and 7, d2 shows substantially the invention as claimed.

However, d2 is not explicit as to the details of more than six contacts.

It is known in the art to have more than 6 contacts. kk is an example within the art that Shows (figures 3a-3c) contacts.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and having access to the references to be able to use the multiple contact teachings of kk within the invention of d2 to meet applicant's claimed structure.

The rationale for such a rejection is that one skilled in the art could have combined the known elements and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

In reference to Claim(s) 8, d2 as modified by kk, shows applicant's claimed structure.

In reference to Claim(s) 10, d2 shows applicant's claimed structure.

In reference to Claim(s) 11, d2 shows a flat part 124 (figure 6).

In reference to Claim(s) 14, d2 shows applicant's claimed structure.

Squires (4975068) is seen to be representative of the pct document of D3: EP 0 431 260 A (INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION) from the PCT report. The examiner agrees with the examination comments of the following:

Dependent claims 2-11 and 14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

5.1 Features of claims 2 and 3 are known from D1 and D3.

5.2 Features of claim 5 are known from D1, D2 and D3. 5.3 Features of claims 6 and 8-11 are known from D2.

5.4 Features described in claims 4, 7 and 14 are merely some of several straight forward possibilities from which the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances,, without the exercise of inventive skill;-in order to-solve the-problem .

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claim(s) listed at box 7 on PTO-FORM 326 has(have) allowable subject matter.
- Claim(s) listed at box 7 on PTO-FORM 326 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: This application claims the following structure:

In reference to Claim(s) 12 and 13 (which depends upon claim 12), the 180 degree curve is not shown.

The above noted structure in combination with all the other elements of the claim is not shown in a publication and the examiner knows of no permissible motivation to combine the

prior art such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made.

- If the application becomes allowable, any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowable Subject Matter".

Conclusion

- The prior art listed on PTO form 892 that is made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure because it shows the state of the art with respect to applicant's claimed invention.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James R. Harvey whose telephone number is 571-272-2007.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee Luebke can be reached on 571-272-2800 extension 33.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2800.

jrh

/James Harvey/
James Harvey
Primary Examiner